



METROPOLITAN  
TRANSPORTATION  
COMMISSION

Joseph E. Russo, MTC Chair  
10 "Light" Street  
Oakland, CA 94612-4000  
TEL: 510.873.7700  
FAX: 510.873.7700  
FAX: 510.873.7700  
FAX: 510.873.7700  
FAX: 510.873.7700

Adrienne P. Tisserand, Chair  
Metropolitan Transportation Commission

Rein Worth, Vice Chair  
Metropolitan Transportation Commission

John J. Adams, Chair  
Metropolitan Transportation Commission

John J. Adams, Chair  
Metropolitan Transportation Commission

John J. Adams, Chair  
Metropolitan Transportation Commission

John J. Adams, Chair  
Metropolitan Transportation Commission

John J. Adams, Chair  
Metropolitan Transportation Commission

John J. Adams, Chair  
Metropolitan Transportation Commission

John J. Adams, Chair  
Metropolitan Transportation Commission

John J. Adams, Chair  
Metropolitan Transportation Commission

John J. Adams, Chair  
Metropolitan Transportation Commission

John J. Adams, Chair  
Metropolitan Transportation Commission

John J. Adams, Chair  
Metropolitan Transportation Commission

John J. Adams, Chair  
Metropolitan Transportation Commission

John J. Adams, Chair  
Metropolitan Transportation Commission

John J. Adams, Chair  
Metropolitan Transportation Commission

John J. Adams, Chair  
Metropolitan Transportation Commission

John J. Adams, Chair  
Metropolitan Transportation Commission

John J. Adams, Chair  
Metropolitan Transportation Commission

John J. Adams, Chair  
Metropolitan Transportation Commission

John J. Adams, Chair  
Metropolitan Transportation Commission

John J. Adams, Chair  
Metropolitan Transportation Commission

**MTC COMMISSION with the ABAG ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE**  
**June 22, 2011**  
**MINUTES**

**Attendance:**

Chair Adrienne Tissier called the MTC Commission meeting to order at 9:46 a.m. MTC Commissioners in attendance were: Vice Chair Rein Worth, Azumbrado, Campos, Cortese, Giacomini, Glover, Green, Haggerty, Halsted, Kinsey, Liccardo, Mackenzie, Mullin, Sperring and Wiener.

Chair Green called the ABAG Administrative Committee meeting to order. Members in attendance were: Adams, Avalos, Cortese, Gioia, Gibson, Haggerty, Liccardo, Pierce, and Sperring.

**Welcome/Introduction:**

MTC Chair Tissier welcomed the Commission, ABAG Committee Members and the public.

ABAG Chair Green asked Brian Kirking to report on the new negotiated lease with Xerox for copier equipment lease. ABAG Executive Director Rapport asked for approval of the lease.

Motion made by Committee member Julie Pierce and second by Committee member Sperring to approve a new Xerox copier equipment lease. Motion passed unanimously.

**Plan Bay Area: Defining Alternative Scenarios**

Miriam Chion (ABAG) began the presentation with an overview of the proposed five land use options for the proposed alternative scenarios, which are similar to the ones presented to the joint MTC Planning and ABAG Administrative Committees on June 2011 but as modified by public and Commission input. She stated that SB 375 requires the region to identify, through the SCS, a housing demand for the projected population across all income categories. It also requires the region to develop a forecasted development pattern for the region which is supported by a transportation system that would reduce green house gas emissions from automobiles and light trucks needs adoption and implementation. She noted that the policy guidelines remain the same, with realistic land use patterns, transportation improvements, and employment distribution that address core concerns and resources and policies.

Commissioner Spering pointed out that during the previous MTC/ABAG committee meeting, staff was asked to address two issues: specifically, (1) what is the region's responsibility for housing future population growth under SB 375? and (2) should a separate scenario focused on equity issues be added?

Ashley Nguyen (MTC) continued by presenting the proposed transportation options for the proposed scenarios, noting that each pivots off of the Transportation 2035 investment strategy. She also presented the proposed policy initiatives to be considered in the scenarios. She then presented the five scenarios, which reflect a mix and match of the five land use options and three transportation options. In response to the equity issues raised, Ashley pointed out the proposed five scenarios are designed to address all three Es (economy, environment, and equity) as well as to maximize achievement of the 10 adopted performance targets, including the three equity targets that focus on housing and displacement, exposure to particulate matter, and housing-transportation costs. She also explained that each of the five scenarios will be subjected to an equity analysis to determine how well that scenario performs against several equity metrics. She stated that staff does not recommend constructing a stand-alone equity scenario, nor scenarios that address only the economy or the environment. Rather, staff expects each scenario to strike a balance amongst the three Es, and for the preferred scenario to be identified in early 2012 to broadly address all three Es as well as to demonstrate how the region can advance the adopted performance targets.

Commissioner Spering requested a response/recommendation for the additional scenario from MTC Executive Director Steve Heminger and ABAG Executive Director Ezra Rapport.

Mr. Rapport did not recommend a sixth scenario and stated that ABAG's perspective and expertise is housing and land use patterns, and that the proposals for the different land use scenarios accomplish what equity groups are asking for. Specifically, he stated that the equity groups were requesting to distribute a substantial portion of the region's overall housing growth to high opportunity communities based on the presence of jobs, high performing schools, transit service levels and other indicators of opportunity. He said that the Priority Development Areas (PDA) structure (which is the framework for all the alternatives) includes all areas of the region that correspond to these various criteria and are designed around transit.

The equity group's second request is to allocate to cities with disproportionately low numbers of lower income residents a proportionally higher percentage of low income housing units. Mr. Rapport stated that this is already a requirement of the RHNA process and is addressed in all of the Alternative Scenarios presented.

Mr. Heminger also did not recommend a sixth scenario as the three Es are the framework for evaluating and testing all of the scenarios. He agreed that equity must be a strong consideration in all the scenarios and believes all will have components that are being recommended by the equity groups.

Mr. Heminger added that the request by the equity groups to “prioritize capital funds than cannot be shifted or swapped to transit operations for maintenance of the existing system” is a concern as there is a current Commission agenda item to transfer \$25 million of capital funds to AC Transit to continue their existing operations. He noted that this exception to MTC policy will lead to further destabilization of the transit capital program and that the region should not be doing this as it is one of the reasons for implementing the Transit Sustainability Project. He further commented that this recommendation would potentially create a \$4 billion hole in our transit capital program which already faces a \$17 billion shortfall. He does not recommend that we evaluate such a strategy. He believes, with this exception, the other items will be addressed in the five scenarios that are being proposed for evaluation.

Public Comment was received from the following:

Joshua Hugg, Housing Leadership Council of San Mateo: spoke in favor of adding a sixth equity scenario.

Azibuike Akaba, BAMP: spoke in favor of the equity, jobs and environment scenario and suggests a separate equity scenario analysis be considered.

Sheila Lumford, ACCE: spoke in favor of the equity, environment and jobs scenario.

Bob Allen, Urban Habitat: spoke in favor of an alternative equity scenario.

Sandi Galvez, Bay Area Regional Health Inequities Initiative: asked the Commissioners and Members to place priority on the scenarios that offer the greatest public health and equity benefits.

Alla Phelps, ACCE: urged that the equity scenario be further researched.

Parisa Fatehl, Public Advocates: urges a stand alone equity, environment and jobs scenario.

Carl Anthony, Breathe Through Communities: urges a stand alone equity, environment and jobs scenario and if necessary replace the fifth scenario with this.

Duane Dewitt, Transit Rider: Prior to formally deciding on the scenarios, he urged that further research and considerations be made.

Marge, citizen: stated she had attended various vision session meetings and did not witness a consensus of opinions expressed by the citizens that were present.

Beth Walukas, Alameda CTC: supports the five land use scenarios with equity, environment and economic issues addressed across all scenarios.

Heather G.: requests a delay in voting as previous concerns have not been addressed.

Pat G.: found it disturbing that centralized planning and development had not been presented to the voters as an initiative. She also felt that the public was misinformed about the One Bay Area Outreach program.

David T., taxpayer: attended various visioning sessions and felt there wasn't a consensus in any of the wild cards that were also neglected to be discussed in an email. He also believed that voices heard at Plan Bay Area Outreach events fell on deaf ears with people as they disagreed with the agenda. He requested a moratorium on the process; an investigation of sources of funding and accounting of spending.

Sasha Hauswald, SF Mayor's Office – Housing: asked that the RHNA methodology is considered as she is concerned that the SCS alternative scenarios are not aligned with the RHNA methodology of land use distribution.

Tilly Chang, San Francisco Transportation Authority: does not agree with staff's 175% income distribution presentation as she believes it is not sufficient to address equity. She also recommends a modification to Alternative 1 to allow for consistency between the SCS and RHNA allocation which was recommended by the working groups and to modify Alternative 5 which would advance the overall equity goal of assigning housing to communities which have higher performing schools and jobs within transit.

Egon Templan, SPUR: believes that transportation dollars and policy be used to shape where growth should go. He also felt that road pricing should be reconsidered.

Marcia Lovelace, Genesis: supports the equity scenario.

Frank Gallo, Ditching Dirty Diesel: supports the equity scenario.

Kirsten Schwinn, Bay Localize: supports the equity, environment and job scenario.

Mahasin Abdul Soloam, Genesis: supports a robust equity component.

Jeff Hobson, Transform: asks that Scenario Five be eliminated and replaced with the equity, environment and job scenario and make the "fix-it first" approach a priority.

Joana Jones, Marin Grassroots: urged the Commission to hear the voices of the communities of concern which have requested an increase of equity and justice in the transportation planning processes and that bus transportation and bus transit be a priority.

Wendy Alfson, SF Bay Walks: supports the equity scenario.

Marilynne Mellander: is against the Plan Bay Area Plan and believes that her tax dollars should not be used to achieve social equity.

Janet Macorani: feels that the electorate should be more thoroughly informed prior to decisions being made and actions taken.

Stephanie Reyes, Greenbelt Alliance: supports all six scenarios.

Carole Haskell, citizen: believes that the scenarios presented cannot be evaluated fully without costs associated with them. She also requested that social and economic ramifications be considered.

Andy Katz, Breathe California: encourages a comprehensive study that can be taken as an independent scenario.

Pat Ferguson, citizen: believes that the Plan Bay Area Plan leaves out the poor – equity and employment opportunities must be a priority.

Hamad Walls, St. Mary's: supports the social equity scenario.

Gaby Miller, Genesis: feels that equity is not addressed properly and needs further definition in all five scenarios.

Wafaa Aborashed, Bay Area Healthy 880 Communities: asks that public transportation dollars not be eliminated and noted that people are highly impacted by transportation along the freeway. Public transportation should be a priority in all stages of planning.

Lindsay Imai, Urban Habitat: supports the equity, environment and job scenario.

Joel Ervice, Regional Asthma Management and Prevention: although he supports the equity, environment and job scenario he welcomes a separate scenario.

Commissioner Sperring asked Mr. Heminger to address and provide his recommendation regarding the criticisms regarding the transportation options of the expanded networks and “fix it first” component.

Mr. Heminger recommends that the fifth scenario not be dropped but to alter the transportation network that is used to evaluate it. Three networks have been laid out. The first network is in the current plan, the middle one is a core transit capacity network and the fifth would reduce maintenance funding substantially. He recommends the third one be deleted and instead evaluate the fifth scenario with the existing transportation plan so that the current network would be used to evaluate the 1<sup>st</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, and 5<sup>th</sup> and the middle one would be used to evaluate the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup>, allowing the elimination of the expanded network.

Commissioner Green also does not recommend a sixth scenario and believes that the advocates' concerns will be addressed in all 5 scenarios. He also agrees with public comment that it is too early to give up on all scenarios driving toward the first two goals but all 5 scenarios need to address what it takes to make GHG reductions and the housing production goals. He also commented that an implementation schedule and cost analysis be included in the scenarios.

ABAG Committee member John Gioia believes there is a disconnect in achieving social equity in all five scenarios and requires further discussion.

ABAG Committee member Susan Adams questions how resources will be obtained to subsidize the affordable housing in high expense areas. She suggests a cost analysis be included in the scenarios and believes the equity option and analysis need further discussion.

Mr. Rapport responded that the intent of the three options was to show transparency regarding the different shifting of growth and the impact amongst the PDAs regarding the building of affordable housing.

Commissioner Campos values and supports a separate equity scenario and what it means to include and engage advisory group/advocates input. He commented on what he believed was the disconnect in what staff is saying and what the advocates are requesting. He would also like to hear from the business community and requested that the process be slowed down to reach out to more members of the community.

Commissioner Mackenzie also believes that more time is needed to analyze a separate equity scenario, and agrees with Commissioner Campos that the Policy Advisory Committee's concerns be given more analysis.

ABAG Committee member Avalos believes and supports an additional sixth social equity scenario or would like additional discussions with the equity groups to alter the five existing scenarios.

Commissioner Spring moved to adopt the existing five scenarios as presented and have staff return with more definition and explanation on all scenarios. Second by Commissioner Green.

In discussion of the motion, Commissioner Glover asked for staff to come back with full integration of the five options.

Commissioner Cortese requested the five scenarios move forward but requested additional articulation on how we would catch the equity issue later during the fund allocation process.

Commissioner Wiener does not support moving forward with a sixth scenario and would like to eliminate scenario 5 as he does not want to spend more time evaluating and encouraging additional sprawl in the outer Bay Area.

Commissioner Campos inquired as to why this issue is being pushed for a vote. Mr. Heminger answered that time constraints and deadlines have to be met, and that it would be helpful if staff at least could get started on defining and evaluating the five scenarios while a potential sixth scenario is considered further.

An alternate motion was offered by Commissioner Campos, second by Commissioner Mackenzie, to not vote on these scenarios as presented and continue discussion at a later date. Motion failed with two yes votes by Commissioners Campos and Mackenzie; and 11 noes by Commissioners Cortese, Glover, Green, Halsted, Kinsey, Liccardo, Mullin, Spering, Wiener, Rein Worth and Tissier. Commissioner Haggerty was absent during vote.

A substitute motion was moved by Commissioner Liccardo, second by Commissioner Halsted, for the approval of the four scenarios and further discussion on the fifth and the possibility of a sixth. Motion failed with seven noes by Commissioners Cortese, Glover, Green, Kinsey, Spering, Rein Worth, and Tissier and six yeses by Campos, Halsted, Liccardo, Mackenzie, Mullin and Wiener. Commissioner Haggerty was absent during vote.

The Commission returned to the initial motion made by Commissioner Spering second by Commissioner Green to adopt the existing five scenarios as presented and have staff return with more definition and explanation on all scenarios. Motion passed with 11 yeses by Commissioners Cortese, Glover, Green, Halsted, Kinsey, Liccardo, Mullin, Spering, Wiener, Rein Worth and Tissier; and two noes by Campos and Mackenzie. Commissioner Haggerty was absent during vote.

The ABAG Administrative Committee voted as follows on the same motion: Six yes votes by Committee members Cortese, Gibson, Green, Liccardo, Pierce and Spering; and two no votes by Committee members Gioia and Avalos. Committee member Adams was absent during vote.

There being no further business or public comment the Joint MTC Commission with the ABAG Administrative Committee meeting was adjourned at 12:15 p.m.